

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, independent claim 3 with dependent claims 2, 6-8, 10 and 11, independent claim 4 with dependent claims 12-18, and independent claim 5 with dependent claims 19-25 will be present in the application.


Claims 3, 4 and 5 have been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of claim 1, which is hereby canceled. Claims 2, 6-8, 10 and 11 have been amended to depend from claim 3. New claims 12-18 and 19-25 are identical to claims 2, 6-8, 10 and 11, except that claims 12-18 depend from claim 4 and claims 19-25 depend from claim 5. Accordingly, the amendments do not introduce any new matter.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 4,312,280 (Shearer et al). Claims 2, 6 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Shearer in view of U.S. 4,782,772 (Chughtai et al.). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Shearer in view of U.S. 4,915,920 (Kobayashi). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Shearer. The Office Action indicated that claims 3-5 are allowable. Claims 3, 4 and 5 have been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, the rejections of record are moot.

The various dependent claims add additional features to the independent claims, and are therefore believed to be allowable. Also, the dependent claims are believed patentably distinct on their own merits as being directed to combinations not suggested by the references. For example, claim 7 recites that the subject cleaning apparatus further comprises "means for grinding the mixture of ash, reaction product, and unreacted SO₂ sorbent disposed intermediate the combustion chamber and the mixing unit." The Office Action alleges that Kobayashi teaches "means for grinding the mixture of ash, reaction product, and unreacted SO₂ sorbent disposed intermediate the combustion chamber and the mixing unit (2, fig. 2) for the purpose of improving the agglomeration effect." However, the Kobayashi system includes a pulverized coal fired boiler, not a circulating fluidized bed combustor. No unreacted SO₂ sorbent is hydrated in a mixer. Accordingly, the "hydrated unreacted SO₂ sorbent particles" recited in claim 7 cannot be returned to the furnace of the combustor for reactivation, since no the "hydrated unreacted SO₂ sorbent particles" are present.

In view of the above-directed amendments and the proceeding remarks, prompt and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean X. Morin et al

By 
Clifford P. Kelly
Registration No. 35,213
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP
Attorney for Applicant

750 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103-2721
(860) 527-9211
June 21, 2004
Our Ref: EVT/134/US
CPK/io